2905 Longshore Ave.
Philadelphia, Pa. 19149
October 20, 1966

Dear Mr. Weisberg —

Finished reading your book and once again — congratulations on a masterpiece of analysis and detection.

The only possibilities I found for correction are very minor, from page 157 onwards:

RIGHT Page 157 — 11th line. Quote should read "essential findings".

RIGHT Page 157 — 38th line. My question concerns your use and reference on "back wound", where you refer to R-115. On R-115 the only reference to a "back" wound is on the first line, and this does not concern Kennedy, but Connally. I think you mean to refer to "R-105".

RIGHT Page 158 — lines 23 and 24. Your quotation (as many others) is correct in essense, yet is not recorded exactly. This may not bother you, but I'd re-check all quotes if I were you, anyway, since (as I said in a previous letter), it would

recheck by yourself before re-printing, for the reasons already given. It is very difficult for me to catch all these errors because I work alone, but perhaps you could read them and have your good wife check them out while you read. It would be a simple matter with two people checking together, whereas it is not easy for one person, such as myself, to do it alone.

Now, for additional comments:

You have a hard-hitting book from beginning to end, but it seems to me that like Jesus at Cana, you saved the best to the last. The end of the book is where you use the big guns!

Were you the first to discover the "False Oswald"? I think so.

Your skill in realizing that when Zapruder became unsteady — that is the time the shots must have been fired — was a powerful discovery; very convincing.

But, you really demolished the Report, and the self-satisfied confidence in it

be possible for a critic to attack your book as a whole by using your inexact quotations as a basis for claiming that you followed the example of the Report by doctoring to suit your own purposes. Do not misunderstand — I make no attack. I merely tell you what could happen, in my opinion.

(W) Page 168 — 16th line from bottom and following. The page you discovered to be apparently cut in half is titled "Statement." The following two pages (typed on a different machine) are titled "Summary." Therefore, even though half of the first page may be missing, the three pages would seem to be otherwise complete — in other words, no full page appears to be missing. "Page 2" refers not to the three page document, but only to the second part — the "Summary."

Right Page 168 — 7th line from bottom. Did you realize that your point would be made more strongly by carrying the quote from the Report more fully? Thus: "a small penetrating wound of entrance" — all within quotation marks, even though the word "entrance" is abbreviated in the Report. Abbreviated

or no, the word is the same.

Right Page 171 — 7th line from bottom and following. Quote is inaccurate in two places. "The Commission" should be taken out of quotes, or else should be followed by a series of dots to show a break in the quote. The end should read: "exit on the front of" or else dots should appear where these words are omitted.

Right Page 172 — 16th and 17th line. Another inexact quotation. Leave the word "the" out of quotes. After "fragment", add "in the thigh".

Right Page 172 — 14th line from bottom. Change "the Governor's" to read "Governor Connally."

Right Page 172 — 9th line from bottom. Change "virtually lost" to "lost virtually".

Right Page 179 — 14th line. Eliminate the word "a" in the quotation, and replace the word "in" with the word "to".

There was no use in my going further. I found no major errors whatever, but a great many misquotations such as here listed. I would suggest a

method of security? I really and truly would like to know these answers. Can you give them? Is there really such "cloak and dagger" stuff in the world of reality? Please do answer these questions, for I am not even thinking of those who conspired to kill the President! My questions are in regard to possible conspirators to protect the identity of the assassins! Where is the security here? This is what I'm asking you about.

I recall that when you were interviewed on the Burke program in New York, you mentioned that the mortality rate among witnesses in this case has been unnaturally high. Yet, these people are not listed in the book. May I ask who among the witnesses have died? By now, you know how interested I am in this case. I hope you will tell me.

October 22, 1966

It is now Saturday evening, and I just got home from work and found your letter. Sorry to learn that I won't be

which most readers have had, in your analysis of the Number of Shots and The Autopsy! I am no detective, yet I knew from October 1964 for a certainty, and before that as a strong suspicion, that something was radically wrong with the diagrams in the newspapers, and then finally in the Report of the various places the President was supposedly hit by the so-called "neck wound". But, it remained for you to remove all doubt of "mistakes" having been made by those who made the diagrams! And your final wind-up about the FBI report, and your incomparable words — "Are these really questions? Is there, in fact, now any basic question other than who the assassins are?" — following your utter and complete destruction of the Report — why in common sense doesn't the Press pick you up and give you a hearing? Is everyone hell-bent on sacrificing truth for the sake of the Government's embarrasment? My understanding is that the rest of the world already knows the official story is a fake, anyhow. So,

who is being kidded? Is it only the American people who are so immature and naive that they cannot be subjected to the truth, but must nourish themselves on fairy tales?

What is your personal opinion as to Dr. McClelland's testimony that Kennedy was hit in the left temple? Do you give any credence whatever to the possibility that this is a mistake?

If, as the FBI says, the back wound never exited, what about the wound in the front of the neck? Even supposing this to be an entrance wound — where did it exit? Is it possible that when the Report continually changes it's description from a "neck" to a "back" wound that in truth there were both? One an entrance wound, with no exit wound corresponding, below the shoulder; and another — either an entrance or an exit in the neck to correspond with the anterior neck wound? Or, what about a "left temple" wound? As you have said — why the missing frames from the Zapruder film? And,

why were the photographs and X-Rays never made public? For "reasons of taste"? Anyone reading the descriptions in the Report already knows what to expect to see. So, why not show the photographs? To suppress evidence, — or to spare delicate stomachs? But, do doctors who perform autopsys have such delicate stomachs that even they can't be allowed to see the photographs which they, themselves, made? What is the alternative? It would seem only one conclusion can be made — and why? Who could it be that anyone would want to "cover"? This last is exactly the question to which I cannot even imagine an answer. For if there actually were people to be "covered", how many people are in on the "covering"? How could so many people be made (or "sold on") such cooperation? Answer me please — is such a thing within the realm of even remote possibility? Wouldn't every single person with such knowledge be a constant threat? If so, what is the

(12)

caught. The two factors don't jibe. Either he'd want a chance at complete escape without suspicion, or else he'd be impatient to be caught so that he could brag of his accomplishment. He apparently wanted neither, which makes me believe he wasn't in on it at all. But, as I've already admitted, I am no analyst. Between you and Epstein, it is now beyond reason to believe he carried the rifle to the Depository on Nov. 22nd, and I don't believe a word of Marina's testimony. According to Epstein, the Commission staff were wild because of her obvious untruths, although Warren did not question her veracity. And, I think you pointed out how utterly beyond reason was her story about Walker.

After looking over some of the Exhibits, I will try to locate the book you suggested I compare against "Whitewash". Right now, I am impatient to at least look at the 26 Volumes. Much success with your new book.

Sincerely — Jack

(9)

of use insofar as the pictures are concerned, but I'm glad you understood my motive in offering. When you mention a picture of George de Mohrenschildt, do you mean a photo of him, or one taken by him? I will look around on Monday and let you know (if I find anything) the people to write to in order to request it. My references to Exhibits 59 and 60 was faulty — you do know the ones I meant. "59" and "60" are the FBI numbers, not the Commission numbers.

No, I cannot receive Channel #5, and I am severly disappointed that I will not be able to hear the tape of yourself and Mark Lane — I did not even know of the tape till your letter came. I have a tape recorder, and would have taped it, myself, if I could receive the program — but, I can't. I don't suppose there would be any way to get a duplicate, would there?

Also, I did not know you had a sequel to "Whitewash" — I really look forward to reading it! Do you have a publisher, this time?

May I ask a special favor? If McKinney <u>does</u> invite you to WCAU again, please let me know in advance so that I won't miss it. I'd really appreciate this.

Your sentence: "It is not true that I did not answer the question who was behind the assassination ...." but that it "escapes most people." I must confess that with all my (I thought) diligent study of your book, I was nevertheless one of those whom it escaped. Can you give me a hint as to what part to re-read? I do not for a moment hesitate to admit that I am no detective or analyist like yourself. If I were, I probably could not admire you so much — my admiration is because you possess so many powers of observation that I do <u>not</u> have.

In the two days which have elapsed since the beginning of this letter, I have

begun — and completed — "Inquest" by Edward Jay Epstein. It took about 12 hours to read his book, and about a month to read yours. I suppose you know that "Inquest" has parts of the FBI Report printed in it's pocket-edition that were not in the hard-bound edition. He (Epstein) evidentally did not read "Whitewash", for he still accepts theories which you have thoroughly destroyed. He also accepts Oswald as <u>one</u> of the assassins; I do not know <u>what</u> your opinion on that is. I am no expert, but my own feeling is that he <u>had</u> to be a fall guy. On the one hand, he was awfully stupid if he actually was involved, for he gave himself no chance to escape detection — and on the other hand, he was not (like Booth) just awaiting the opportunity to proclaim himself the destroyer of the tyrant, before all the world — therefore it would seem he did not <u>want</u> to be